

From Hopf-Lax formula to optimal weak transfer plan

Yan Shu*

September 13, 2016

Abstract

We study the properties of Hopf-Lax formula restricted to convex functions and characterize the optimal transfer plan for weak transport problem.

key words: Weak transport costs; Hopf-Lax formula

1 Introduction

1.1 Monge-Kantorovich problem and weak transport cost

Throughout the paper, the space would be Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{R}^n$. We denote $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of probability measures of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\|\cdot\|$ the Euclidean norm.

Let μ, ν be two probability measures of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Recall the classical Monge-Kantorovich problem is minimizing the following transportation cost:

$$\mathcal{T}_c(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi} \int c(x, y) d\pi,$$

where $c : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called the cost function and π is a measure coupling with marginal μ and ν . Readers can refer to [18] to a very nice introduction of optimal transport theory. One of the most interesting case is that the cost function c is a convex function with respect to the distance d . One of the well known result about the optimal transfer plan is due to Brenier [2] in 1991, he proved that on a finite dimension real space, the optimal transport mapping is a gradient of some convex function. In particular, in dimension one, the optimal transfer plan does not depend on the cost function any more as soon as the cost is convex. We also refer readers for related results about the optimal transfer plan to [5], [12], [14].

Here we interest in the optimal transfer plan of a variant of Monge-Kantorovich problem, which is introduced by four of the authors in [7], a general optimal transportation problem, defined by

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_c(\nu|\mu) = \inf_{\pi} \int c(x, p) \mu(dx).$$

*Modélisation aléatoire de Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense(MODAL'X), Email: yshu@u-paris10.fr

Here the cost function c is defined on the space $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the infimum runs over all couplings $\pi(dxdy) = p(x, dy)\mu(dx)$ of μ and ν , and where $p(x, \cdot)$ denotes the disintegration kernel of π with respect to its first marginal.

In terms of random variables, one has the following interpretation

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_c(\nu|\mu) = \inf \mathbb{E}(c(X, \mathbb{E}(Y|X))) .$$

whereas

$$\mathcal{T}_c(\nu, \mu) = \inf \mathbb{E}(c(X, Y)) ,$$

where in both cases the infimum runs over all random variables X, Y such that X follows the law μ and Y the law ν . Those general transport costs play a central role in the study of Talagrand type transport inequalities and some log-Sobolev inequalities, especially in a discrete space such as graphs, or a subset of vector space. Those transport inequalities immediately yields concentrations results and tensorization properties of the measure (see [3, 7, 6, 16, 15]).

In this paper, we will in particular interest in the case that all cost functions considered are of form $c(x, y) = \theta(\|x - y\|)$, where θ is convex and vanished at 0. In what follows, taking two probability measures μ, ν in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the optimal weak transport cost of ν with respect to μ of cost $\theta : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ means

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \inf_{\pi} \int \theta \left(\|x - \int y p(x, dy)\| \right) \mu(dx)$$

where the infimum runs over all couplings $\pi(dxdy) = p(x, dy)\mu(dx)$ of μ and ν , and where $p(x, \cdot)$ denotes the disintegration kernel of π with respect to its first marginal. Since the θ is convex, by Jensen's inequality, one has

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) \leq \mathcal{T}_\theta(\nu, \mu).$$

This weak transport cost is deeply linked to the Monge-Kantorovich problem. Recently, together with Gozlan, Roberto, Samson and Tetali, following Strassen's theorem [17], we proved in [6] that,

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \inf_{\nu_1 \preceq \nu} \mathcal{T}_\theta(\nu_1, \mu),$$

where $\preceq$ is the convex order, defined as:

$$\nu_1 \preceq \nu \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall f \text{ convex}, \int f d\nu_1 \leq \int f d\nu.$$

Moreover, in dimension one, the measure ν_1 which achieves the infimum does not depend on the choice of the convex cost function θ . As an application, we deduced a completed characterization of a convex modified Log-Sobolev inequality.

1.2 Presentation of the results

It is natural to ask the following questions about the optimal transfer plan of weak transport problem:

- When the weak transport would be equal to the classical transport?
- Is it the optimal coupling depends on the cost function θ ?

We approach those questions by the following duality form of the weak transport cost, following [7].

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \sup_{f \text{ convex}} \int Q_1^\theta f d\mu - \int f d\nu, \quad (1.1)$$

where

$$Q_t^\theta f(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ f(y) + t\theta \left(\frac{\|y - x\|}{t} \right) \right\}.$$

The operator Q_t^θ is often referred to Hopf-Lax formula, in some references it is also called the inf-convolution operator. The Hopf-Lax formula is known as the solution of a Hamilton Jacobi's equation, and have been widely studied in many different contexts.

Except the introduction, the paper is divided into two sections. In section 2, the space will be the real line $\mathbb{R}$, and in section 3, the space will be $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In section 2, we stay on dimension one. We provide an equivalent condition for the equality between the weak transport cost and the classical Monge-Kantorovich transport cost (Theorem 2.5), which states that

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{T}(\nu, \mu)$$

if and only if the difference between the inverse cumulative functions of μ and ν is non decreasing, precisely, the function

$$F_\mu^{-1} - F_\nu^{-1}$$

is non decreasing.

On the other hand, according to Brenier [2], in dimension one, the optimal mapping of a classical transport does not depends on the cost function as soon as the cost function is convex. In [6], the same result is obtained for weak transport cost. We will give a new proof of this result in section 2, using a very different argument. During this approach, a byproduct about Hamilton-Jacobi's equation is obtained, which has its own interest (theorem 2.9).

In section 3, the space will be $\mathbb{R}^n$. We will extend the results of section 2 and look for conditions when the equality $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu)$ will hold in proposition 3.15 and theorem 3.18. We will introduce a class of functions denoted by $\mathcal{F}$, which is the set of all convex functions in the case of dimension one. The condition that the equality holds is deeply related to the set $\mathcal{F}$.

In section 4, we briefly explain some applications on the infimum convolution inequality introduced by Maurey in [11].

The set $\mathcal{F}$ will be defined in section 3. We can see that if the weak transport cost equals the transport cost, then the optimal transportation mapping does not depend on cost function anymore. Together with the fact that in dimension one, the optimal transportation mapping is always independent of the cost function. does not depend on θ , we obtain immediately theorem 2.1 and theorem 2.5.

2 Weak transport on the line

In this section we will focus on the real line.

2.1 A remark on Hopf-Lax formula

We begin with some development of the Hopf-Lax formula. The key observation is the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Given $t > 0$, let $T_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an application from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Then*
(i) If there exists a differentiable convex function f defined on $\mathbb{R}$ and a differentiable strictly convex cost θ (recall that a cost function here should be positive and vanishing on 0) such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, it holds

$$Q_t^\theta f(x) = f(T_t(x)) + t\theta\left(\frac{T_t(x) - x}{t}\right). \quad (2.2)$$

then T_t is strictly increasing and $x \mapsto T_t(x) - x$ is non-increasing.

(ii) Inversely, taking a function T_t defined on $\mathbb{R}$, if T_t is strictly increasing and $x \mapsto T_t(x) - x$ is non-increasing, then for all convex cost θ , there exists a convex function f , such that (2.2) holds.

Remark 2.3. *One can remove the assumption of differentiability, it is only for simplifying unnecessary technical discussions.*

Proof. (i). Given $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, by convexity of f and θ , the function $G : u \mapsto f(u) + t\theta\left(\frac{u-x}{t}\right)$ is strictly convex, it allows at most one minimum. Therefore, the application T_t is characterize by

$$G'(T_t(x)) = f'(T_t(x)) + \theta'\left(\frac{T_t(x) - x}{t}\right) = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

We will firstly prove that T_t is strictly increasing. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x < y$, since θ' is strictly increasing, we deduce that

$$G'(T_t(y)) = f'(T_t(y)) + \theta'\left(\frac{T_t(y) - x}{t}\right) > f'(T_t(y)) + \theta'\left(\frac{T_t(y) - y}{t}\right) = 0.$$

Together with the monotonicity of function G' , we can conclude that T_t is strictly increasing.

Thus, from (2.4), one can write

$$T_t(x) - x = t\theta'^{-1}(-f'(T_t(x))),$$

where the term on the right hand side is well defined since θ'^{-1} is well define on its domain and $-f'(T_t(x))$ lies on the domain of θ'^{-1} .

Since θ'^{-1} , f' and T_t are increasing, we deduce that $x \mapsto T_t(x) - x$ is decreasing.

(ii). Assume that the function T_t is strictly increasing and $x \mapsto T_t(x) - x$ is decreasing. Denote $I := \text{Im}T_t \subset \mathbb{R}$. Since T_t is strictly increasing, T_t^{-1} is an application well define on I . Construct a function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ as following: For all $y \in I$, define

$$g_I(y) := -\theta' \left(\frac{y - T_t^{-1}(y)}{t} \right).$$

The function $y \in I \mapsto \frac{y - T_t^{-1}(y)}{t}$ is decreasing since $x \mapsto T_t(x) - x$ is decreasing. Thus, by convexity of θ , g_I is increasing on I and there exists an increasing function $g : [\inf I, \sup I] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $g = g_I$ on I .

Take $a \in I$, for all $x \in [\inf I, \sup I]$, let $f(x) := g(a) + \int_a^x g(t)dt$. By monotonicity of g , we conclude that f is convex on $[\inf I, \sup I]$ and for all $y \in I$, $g(y) \in (\partial_- f(y), \partial_+ f(y))$. Therefore, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, it holds

$$-\theta' \left(\frac{T_t(x) - x}{t} \right) \in (\partial_- f(T_t(x)), \partial_+ f(T_t(x))),$$

which is equivalent to

$$0 \in \left(\partial_- f(T_t(x)) + \theta' \left(\frac{T_t(x) - x}{t} \right), \partial_+ f(T_t(x)) + \theta' \left(\frac{T_t(x) - x}{t} \right) \right).$$

Thus the equation (2.2) holds. The conclusion follows by extending f on $\mathbb{R}$. $\square$

2.2 Characterization of equality between weak transport cost and transport cost

We firstly recall the definition of cumulative distribution function and its inverse.

For a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$, denote F_μ the cumulative distribution function of μ , i.e.

$$F_\mu(x) = \mu(-\infty, x],$$

and define the generalized inverse of F_μ^{-1} by

$$F_\mu^{-1}(t) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R}; F_\mu(x) < t\}.$$

Theorem 2.5. *Let μ, ν be two probability measures of $\mathbb{R}$ and θ a strictly convex cost. Assume that μ and ν are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. Assume that there exists some couplings of μ and ν such that the weak transport is finite, then*

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu)$$

if and only if $F_\mu^{-1} - F_\nu^{-1}$ is non decreasing.

Now we are in position to prove theorem 2.5. We remark that the assumption of absolute continuity is unnecessary, but it allows to reduce a lot of regularity discussions.

In dimension one, given two probability measures μ and ν absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, the optimal transport mapping for transport problem is transporting mass from location $F_\mu^{-1}(x)$ to location $F_\nu^{-1}(x)$. This mapping is in fact the monotonous rearrangement T from μ to ν . We will play with the Kantorovich duality formula related to this mapping T for the weak transport problem.

Proof. We assume at first that $F_\mu^{-1} - F_\nu^{-1}$ is decreasing. Assume that μ and ν have no atom and denote T the monotone rearrangement from μ to ν . Thus it holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$F_\mu(x) = \mu(-\infty, x) = \nu(-\infty, T(x)) = F_\nu(T(x)).$$

Now given $u \in (0, 1)$, denote $x = F_\nu^{-1}(u)$. According to the latter equality, it holds

$$F_\mu^{-1}(u) - F_\nu^{-1}(u) = x - T(x).$$

According to our hypothesis, we have $x \mapsto x - T(x)$ is non decreasing. Moreover, notice that T is the monotone push forward from μ to ν , we can apply theorem 2.1, and there exists a convex function f , such that

$$Qf(x) = \inf_y \mathbb{R}\{f(y) + \theta(y - x)\} = f(T(x)) + \theta(T(x) - x).$$

By Kantorovich duality from [8], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) &= \sup_{\varphi \text{ convex}} \int Q\varphi d\mu - \int \varphi d\nu \\ &\geq \int Qf d\mu - \int f d\nu = \int \theta(T(x) - x) d\mu \\ &= \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu) \geq \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, all the inequality in the above formula should be equality, and we obtain

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu).$$

Now assume that $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu)$. Let f be the convex function such that

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \int Qf d\mu - \int f d\nu.$$

(With some minor regularity assumptions, the supremum in (1.1) is attained.) Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) &= \int Qf d\mu - \int f d\nu \\ &\leq \int f(T(x)) + \theta(T(x) - x) d\mu - \int f d\nu = \int \theta(T(x) - x) d\mu \\ &= \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $Qf(x) = f(T(x)) + \theta(T(x) - x)$ μ almost-surely. Since f is convex and θ is strictly convex, according to theorem 2.1, there exists T_1 strictly increasing such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$Qf(x) = f(T_1(x)) + \theta(T_1(x) - x).$$

Hence, $T_1 = T$ μ almost-surely. By theorem 2.1, it holds $T(x) - x$ is non-increasing μ almost surely, which implies the conclusion. $\square$

2.3 Weak transfer plan

This section we give an alternative proof of a theorem in [6], as a consequence of theorem 2.1. which is the following:

Theorem 2.6. *[[6]] Let α, β and θ be convex functions satisfying $\alpha + \beta = \theta$. Then it holds*

$$\overline{T}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \overline{T}_\alpha(\nu|\mu) + \overline{T}_\beta(\nu|\mu), \quad (2.7)$$

for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$.

We need to prove the following proposition at first.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $\alpha, \beta, \theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex cost functions of class C^1 satisfying $\alpha + \beta = \theta$. We assume that θ is strictly convex. Then for all convex function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ bounded from below of class C^1 , there exists convex functions f_1 and f_2 , of class C^1 , such that*

$$f = f_1 + f_2$$

and for all $t > 0$

$$Q_t^\theta f = Q_t^\alpha f_1 + Q_t^\beta f_2$$

more precisely,

$$f_1(x) = a + \int_0^x \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1} \circ f'(u) du,$$

with any constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

From this proposition, combining with the fact that $Q_t^\theta f$ is in fact the solution of Hamilton Jacobi equation (2.10), one deduce immediately the following theorem:

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a strictly convex cost function with super-linear growth (i.e. $\theta'(x)$ goes to ∞ as x goes to ∞). Consider the following Hamilton Jacobi's equation:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v(x, t) + \theta^*(\partial_x v(x, t)) = 0 & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \\ v(x, 0) = f(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

Assume that the initial function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex and bounded from below of class C^1 , then for all convex cost function θ_1, θ_2 , with super-linear growth and satisfying $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = \theta$, there exists v_1 and v_2 , such that for $i = 1, 2$, it holds

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v_i(x, t) + \theta_i^*(\partial_x v_i(x, t)) = 0 & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \\ v_i(x, 0) = f_i(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

and $v = v_1 + v_2$.

We begin with a lemma.

Lemma 2.11. *Assume that θ is strictly convex. For $t > 0$, denote $I := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid f'(x) \in \theta(\mathbb{R})\}$. Define the mapping U_t as following*

$$U_t : x \in I \mapsto x + t\theta'^{-1} \circ f'(x) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $T_t = U_t^{-1}$.

Proof. Since θ is strictly convex, $\theta' : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \theta'(\mathbb{R})$ is a bijection and it is strictly increasing. We have $\theta'^{-1} : \theta'(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is well defined as well as U_t . It is easy to see that U_t is strictly increasing and continuous. Now we will show that the image set $U_t(I) = \mathbb{R}$ and U_t is in fact a bijection from I to $\mathbb{R}$.

Assume at first that $\inf I = -\infty$, then it is easy to see that $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} U_t(x) = -\infty$. Now assume that $\inf I > -\infty$. Then for $x \searrow \inf I$, $f'(x) \searrow \theta(-\infty)$, thus $\theta'^{-1}f'(x) \rightarrow -\infty$. The same argument holds for $\sup I$. Therefore, $U_t : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bijective, strictly increasing, so $U_t^{-1} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow I$ is well defined and strictly increasing.

It remains to show that $U_t^{-1}(x)$ is the point achieving the infimum for $Q_t^\theta f(x)$: For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $y = U_t^{-1}(x)$, then it holds

$$\theta' \left(\frac{y - x}{t} \right) = \theta' (\theta'^{-1} \circ f'(y)) = f'(y).$$

According to (2.4), it holds $y = T_t(x)$. □

Now we are in position to prove proposition 2.8

proof of the proposition 2.8. We define f_1 as the following function: for all $y \in I$,

$$f_1(y) := \int_0^y \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1} \circ f'(u) du.$$

and (in the case that $I \neq \mathbb{R}$) f_1 is affine when $y > \sup I$, and $y < \inf I$ with $f_1' = f_1'(\sup I) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \sup I} f_1'(x)$ and $f_1' = f_1'(\inf I)$ respectively.

We observe that f_1 is convex: for all $x \in I$, $f_1' = \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1} \circ f'$ is increasing, and for $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I$, f_1' is constant which equals to $f_1' = f_1'(\sup I)$ and $f_1' = f_1'(\inf I)$ respectively. It follows that f_1' is increasing on $\mathbb{R}$.

Given $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, denote $y = T_t^{-1}(x) \in I$ and it holds

$$\begin{aligned} f_1'(y) &= \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1} \circ f'(y) \\ &= \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1} \circ \theta' \left(\frac{y - x}{t} \right) = \alpha' \left(\frac{y - x}{t} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We deduce from equation (2.4) that

$$Q_t^\alpha f_1(x) = f_1(T_t(x)) + t\alpha \left(\frac{T_t(x) - x}{t} \right). \quad (2.12)$$

Now let $f_2 = f - f_1$, together with $\theta = \alpha + \beta$, we deduce

$$f'_2(x) = \begin{cases} f' - f'_1(\inf I) & \forall x \in (-\infty, \inf I] \\ \beta' \circ \theta'^{-1} \circ f'(x) & \forall x \in I \\ f' - f'_1(\sup I) & \forall x \in [\sup I, \infty) \end{cases},$$

which is increasing. Thus f_2 is convex.

On the other hand, since $f'_1(y) = -\alpha'(\frac{y-x}{t})$ and $f'(y) = -\theta'(\frac{y-x}{t})$, it holds that

$$f'_2(y) = -\beta'\left(\frac{y-x}{t}\right).$$

According to equation (2.4) and we have

$$Q_t^\beta f_2(x) = f_2(T_t(x)) + \beta(T_t(x) - x). \quad (2.13)$$

It immediately yields

$$Q_t^\theta f = Q_t^\alpha f_1 + Q_t^\beta f_2$$

□

Now we are in position to proof the theorem 2.6.

Proof of the theorem 2.6. We first prove that for convex cost functions α and β , if $\theta = \alpha + \beta$ is strictly convex, we have the desire equality (2.7):

Observe that by the definition of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$, it is easy to see that

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) \geq \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha(\nu|\mu) + \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\beta(\nu|\mu). \quad (2.14)$$

Now we turn to prove the inverse inequality.

According to Theorem 2.8, for all convex function f , there exists f_1 and f_2 such that it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \int Q^\theta f d\mu - \int f d\nu &= \int Q^\alpha f_1 d\mu - \int f_1 d\nu + \int Q^\beta f_2 d\mu - \int f_2 d\nu \\ &\leq \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha(\nu|\mu) + \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\beta(\nu|\mu) \end{aligned}$$

We take the supremum over all convex function f and by the duality formula (1.1), we get

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) \leq \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha(\nu|\mu) + \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\beta(\nu|\mu).$$

The conclusion follows with the inverse inequality (2.14).

Now assume that θ is not strictly convex. Take γ a strictly convex cost function. We deduce that $\alpha + \gamma$, $(\alpha + \gamma) + \beta$ are convex, then it holds:

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\theta+\gamma}(\nu|\mu) = \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) + \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\gamma(\nu|\mu).$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\theta+\gamma}(\nu|\mu) &= \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{(\alpha+\gamma)+\beta}(\nu|\mu) = \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha+\gamma}(\nu|\mu) + \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\beta(\nu|\mu) \\ &= \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha(\nu|\mu) + \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\beta(\nu|\mu) + \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\gamma(\nu|\mu). \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows. □

2.4 An alternative approach

The proof of theorem 2.5 in [6] is based on properties of convex ordering and Rado's theorem. In this section, we provide another way to understand theorem 2.1 in aspect of [6].

Here we only recall some necessary definitions and properties of the convex ordering and majorization of vectors. We refer the interested reader to [10], [9] and [13] for further results and bibliographic references, or to [6] for minimal results related to the optimal weak transfer plan.

Definition 2.15 (Convex order). *Given $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R})$, we say that ν_2 dominates ν_1 in the convex order, and write $\nu_1 \preceq \nu_2$, if for all convex functions f on $\mathbb{R}$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\nu_1 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\nu_2$.*

Definition 2.16 (Majorization of vectors). *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, one says that a is majorized by b if the sum of the largest j components of a is less than or equal to the corresponding sum of b , for every j , and if the total sum of the components of both vectors are equal.*

Assuming that the components of $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ are in non-decreasing order (i.e. $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$ and $b_1 \leq b_2 \leq \dots \leq b_n$), a is majorized by b , if

$$a_n + a_{n-1} + \dots + a_{n-j+1} \leq b_n + b_{n-1} + \dots + b_{n-j+1}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

$$\text{and } \sum_{i=1}^n a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i.$$

The next proposition recalls the link between majorization of vectors and convex ordering.

Proposition 2.17. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and set $\nu_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{a_i}$ and $\nu_2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{b_i}$. The following are equivalent*

- (i) a is majorized by b ,
- (ii) ν_1 is dominated by ν_2 for the convex order. In other words, for every convex $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it holds that $\sum_{i=1}^n f(a_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n f(b_i)$.

Thanks to the above proposition and with a slight abuse of notation, we will also write $a \preceq b$ when a is majorized by b .

Now we are able to prove an alternative version of theorem 2.1. We shall focus on measure μ_n of form $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$. For general measure, one can consider it as a limit of μ_n as n goes to ∞ . Then theorem 2.1 is telling the following:

Theorem 2.18 (Alternative approach to theorem 2.1). *Let $\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$ and $\nu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{y_i}$, where x_i and y_i are in non-decreasing order. Assume that θ is a strictly convex cost function. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) the function $i \mapsto x_i - y_i$ is non-decreasing;
- (ii) $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\theta}(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{T}_{\theta}(\nu, \mu)$.

Proof. Observe that the optimal transfer plan of $\mathcal{T}_\theta(\nu, \mu)$ sends x_i to y_i since x_i and y_i are in non-decreasing order. As a consequence,

$$\mathcal{T}_\theta(\nu, \mu) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta(x_i - y_i).$$

On the other hand, denote $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n), y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, following [6],

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \inf_{\nu_1 \preceq \nu} \mathcal{T}_\theta(\nu_1, \mu) = \inf_{y' \preceq y} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta(x_i - y'_i).$$

Thus, item (ii) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \theta(x_i - y_i) = \inf_{y' \preceq y} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta(x_i - y'_i). \quad (2.19)$$

Now it is enough to prove that (2.19) is equivalent to (i).

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): For any $y' \preceq y$, it holds

$$\sum_{i=k}^n y'_i \leq \sum_{i=k}^n y_i \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{i=k}^n x_i - y_i \leq \sum_{i=k}^n x_i - y'_i \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Thus $x - y \preceq x - y'$ for all $y' \preceq y$, which leads to (2.19).

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Assume that (ii) holds and (i) does not. Let i be the smallest integer such that $x_i - y_i > x_{i+1} - y_{i+1}$. Thus $y_{i+1} - y_i - (x_{i+1} - x_i) = 2\varepsilon > 0$.

Now define $y' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $y'_j = y_j$ for $j \neq i, i+1$, $y'_i = y_i + \varepsilon$, $y'_{i+1} = y_{i+1} - \varepsilon$. It is easy to see that $y' \preceq y$ and by convexity of θ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \theta(x_i - y_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \theta(x_i - y'_i) \\ &= \theta(x_i - y_i) + \theta(x_{i+1} - y_{i+1}) - \theta(x_i - y_i - \varepsilon) + \theta(x_{i+1} - y_{i+1} + \varepsilon) \\ &= \theta(x_i - y_i) + \theta(x_{i+1} - y_{i+1}) - 2\theta\left(\frac{(x_i - y_i) + (x_{i+1} - y_{i+1})}{2}\right) \\ &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction with (2.19). $\square$

3 In higher dimension

This section is devoted to extend results of the previous section in higher dimension. The space is $\mathbb{R}^n$. We shall assume that all cost functions are convex and only depending on Euclidian distance $\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_2$.

The main results of this section are proposition 3.15, theorem 3.17 and theorem 3.18, which extend proposition 2.8, theorem 2.9 and theorem 2.5 respectively.

In dimension one, we consider largely the set of convex functions, but in dimension n , we shall first introduce the set $\mathcal{F}$ mentioned in the introduction, who plays the role of the set of convex functions.

Definition 3.1. Denote $\mathcal{F}$ the set of functions satisfying the following assumptions:

1. f is convex of class C^2 .
2. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $\text{Hess}f(x)\nabla f(x) = \lambda f(x)$.

Remark 3.2. For dimension $n = 1$, $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of convex function of class C^2 , since the second condition is always true: $\text{Hess}f$ vanishes and one can always take $\lambda = 0$.

The next subsection introduce some properties of the set $\mathcal{F}$. The Proposition 3.7 is the key tool of the proof of theorem 3.18.

3.1 Some properties

Let us begin with some properties of the set $\mathcal{F}$:

Lemma 3.3. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class C^2 . Denote $u = \|\nabla f\|$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\text{Hess}f(x)\nabla f(x) = \lambda \nabla f(x).$$

- (ii) for all $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, it holds

$$\partial_i u \partial_j f = \partial_j u \partial_i f.$$

From this lemma, we can construct some examples of f such that $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

Example 3.4. In dimension n , the set $\mathcal{F}$ is not an empty set. Here are some non trivial examples:

1. $\mathcal{F}$ contains all linear forms.
2. Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function of class C^2 with $g(0) = 0$, then $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto g(\|x\|) \in \mathcal{F}$.
3. Let $a > 0$ and $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a linear form. Then the application $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto a\|x\|^2 + L(x) \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof of lemma 3.3. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii):

Suppose that (i) holds. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if $\nabla f(x) = 0$, there is nothing to prove. Now assume that $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$. It follows that for all $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$,

$$\partial_i u = \frac{1}{u} \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_k f \partial_{ki} f = \frac{\lambda}{u} \partial_i f. \quad (3.5)$$

Thus

$$\partial_i u \partial_j f = \frac{\lambda}{u} \partial_i f \partial_j f = \partial_j u \partial_i f.$$

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Again we suppose that $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$. There exists j such that $\partial_j f \neq 0$. Let $\lambda = \partial_j u / \partial_j f$, (ii) implies that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\partial_i u = \lambda \partial_i f. \quad (3.6)$$

Computing the differential of u , it holds

$$\partial_i u = \frac{1}{u} \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_k f \partial_{ki} f.$$

Together with (3.6), it holds for all $1 \leq i \leq n$

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \partial_{ki} f \partial_k f = \lambda u \partial_i f,$$

which means exactly $\text{Hess} f \nabla f = \lambda u \nabla f$. $\square$

Proposition 3.7. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function of class C^2 .*

(i) *If $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then for all increasing function $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class C^1 with $G(0) = 0$, there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|\nabla f\|(x) \neq 0$, it holds*

$$\nabla \varphi(x) = G(\|\nabla f\|(x)) \frac{\nabla f(x)}{\|\nabla f\|(x)}, \quad (3.8)$$

and while $\|\nabla f\|(x) = 0$,

$$\nabla \varphi(x) = 0$$

(ii) *If there exists an increasing function $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class C^1 with $G(0) = 0$, such that $xG'(x) - G(x) \neq 0$ for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and there exists a convex function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class C^2 such that equation (3.8) holds, then $f \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. The proof of (i) is divided into three steps:

Step 1. *There exists a function φ of class C^2 such that (3.8) holds.*

Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and such that $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$. Denote $\mathbf{F}$ the vector field $G(\|\nabla f\|) \frac{\nabla f}{\|\nabla f\|}$, then the i^{th} component of $\mathbf{F}$ is :

$$\mathbf{F}_i = G(\|\nabla f\|) \frac{\partial_i f}{\|\nabla f\|}. \quad (3.9)$$

In order to prove the existence of function φ , we only need to show that

$$\text{rot } \mathbf{F} = 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\partial_j \mathbf{F}_i = \partial_i \mathbf{F}_j \quad (3.10)$$

for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Now denote $u = \|\nabla f\|_2$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_j \mathbf{F}_i &= \partial_j \left(\frac{G(u)}{u} \right) \partial_i f + \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_{ij} f \\ &= \partial_j u \left(\frac{G'(u)u - G(u)}{u^2} \right) \partial_i f + \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_{ij} f\end{aligned}$$

The same argument leads to

$$\partial_i \mathbf{F}_j = \partial_i u \left(\frac{G'(u)u - G(u)}{u^2} \right) \partial_j f + \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_{ij} f. \quad (3.11)$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{F}$, applying lemma 3.3, we deduce that

$$\partial_j u \partial_i f = \partial_i u \partial_j f. \quad (3.12)$$

Thus equation (3.10) holds and the existence of φ follows.

Step 2. φ is convex.

Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, assume that $\text{Hess } f \nabla f = \lambda \nabla f$. It is enough to prove that $\text{Hess } \varphi = (\partial_{ij} \varphi)_{ij}$ is positive. According to (3.11) and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{ij} \varphi &= \partial_i \mathbf{F}_j \\ &= \partial_i u \left(\frac{G'(u)u - G(u)}{u^2} \right) \partial_j f + \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_{ij} f \\ &= \frac{G(u)}{u} \left(\partial_{ij} f - \frac{\partial_i u \partial_j f}{u} \right) + \frac{G'(u)}{u^2} \partial_i u \partial_j f \\ &= \frac{G(u)}{u} \left(\partial_{ij} f - \lambda \frac{\partial_i f \partial_j f}{u^2} \right) + \lambda \frac{G'(u)}{u^3} \partial_i f \partial_j f\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that G is increasing and $u > 0$, it follows that $\frac{G(u)}{u} > 0$ and $\frac{G'(u)}{u^3} > 0$. Moreover, the convexity of f implies that $\lambda \geq 0$. Thus, it is enough to prove that the matrix $M_0 = \left(\partial_{ij} f - \lambda \frac{\partial_i f \partial_j f}{u^2} \right)_{ij}$ and $M_1 = (\partial_i f \partial_j f)_{ij}$ are positive.

We begin with the positivity of M_1 . For any vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$${}^t w M_1 w = \sum_{i,j} w_i \partial_i f \partial_j f w_j = \left(\sum_i w_i \partial_i f \right)^2 = \langle w, \nabla f \rangle^2 \geq 0. \quad (3.13)$$

Now we turn to the positivity of M_0 . For any $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, write $w = y + a \nabla f$ with $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and y perpendicular with ∇f . Noticing that $M_0 = \text{Hess } f - \frac{\lambda}{u^2} M_1$, then

$${}^t w M_0 w = {}^t (y + a \nabla f) \left(\text{Hess } f - \frac{\lambda}{u^2} M_1 \right) (y + a \nabla f).$$

Using $\text{Hess } f \nabla f = \lambda \nabla f$ and $u^2 = \|\nabla f\|^2$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}& {}^t (y + a \nabla f) \text{Hess } f (y + a \nabla f) \\ &= \langle y, \text{Hess } f y \rangle + a^2 \langle \nabla f, \text{Hess } f \nabla f \rangle + 2a \langle y, \text{Hess } f \nabla f \rangle \\ &= \langle y, \text{Hess } f y \rangle + a^2 \langle \nabla f, \lambda \nabla f \rangle + 2a \langle y, \lambda \nabla f \rangle \\ &= \langle y, \text{Hess } f y \rangle + a^2 \lambda u^2\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, according to (3.13),

$${}^t(y + a\nabla f) \frac{\lambda}{u^2} M_1 (y + a\nabla f) = \frac{\lambda}{u^2} \langle y + a\nabla f, \nabla f \rangle^2 = \frac{\lambda a^2}{u^2} \langle \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle^2 = \lambda a^2 u^2$$

Thus, together with the convexity of f , we deduce that

$${}^t w M_0 w = {}^t (y + a\nabla f) \left(\text{Hess} f - \frac{\lambda}{u^2} M_1 \right) (y + a\nabla f) = \langle y, \text{Hess} f y \rangle \geq 0.$$

Hence, M_0, M_1 are positive matrix, and $\text{Hess } \varphi = \frac{G(u)}{u} M_0 + \lambda \frac{G'(u)}{u^3} M_1$ is positive.

Step 3. $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$.

The convexity of φ is proved in step 2. It is enough to show that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{Hess} \varphi(x) \nabla \varphi(x) = \lambda \nabla \varphi(x)$. Adapting the notations in step 1, applying lemma 3.3, it is enough to show that

$$\partial_i \|F\| F_j = \partial_j \|F\| F_i. \quad (3.14)$$

If $\|F\|(x) = 0$, there is nothing to prove. Assume that $\|F\|(x) \neq 0$, then $u = \nabla f(x) \neq 0$.

We develop $\partial_i \|F\| F_j$ by (3.9) and (3.11):

$$\begin{aligned} F_j \partial_i \|F\| &= \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_j f \frac{1}{\|F\|} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_k f \left[\partial_i u \left(\frac{G'(u) - G(u)}{u^2} \right) \partial_k f + \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_i f \right] \\ &= A_{ij} + B_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_{ij} := \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_j f \frac{1}{\|F\|} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_k f \left[\partial_i u \left(\frac{G'(u) - G(u)}{u^2} \right) \partial_k f \right]$$

and

$$B_{ij} := \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_j f \frac{1}{\|F\|} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\frac{G(u)}{u} \right)^2 \partial_k f \partial_i f.$$

It is easy to see that $B_{ij} = B_{ji}$. Using (3.12), we deduce that $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$. Therefore, equation (3.14) holds and it follows that $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$. The proof of item (i) is completed.

Now we turn to prove item (ii). Adapting the notations in the step 1 of the proof of item (i). The existence of φ guarantees that

$$\text{rot } \mathbf{F} = 0,$$

Developing the latter equation (see (3.11)), it holds

$$\partial_i u \left(\frac{G'(u)u - G(u)}{u^2} \right) \partial_j f + \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_{ij} f = \partial_j u \left(\frac{G'(u)u - G(u)}{u^2} \right) \partial_i f + \frac{G(u)}{u} \partial_{ij} f.$$

By assumption of G , we deduce that for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\partial_i u \partial_j f = \partial_j u \partial_i f.$$

The conclusion follows by applying lemma 3.3 and the fact that f is of class C^2 . $\square$

Now we present extensions of proposition 2.8 and theorem 2.9 in the n dimension case.

Proposition 3.15. *Let α, β, θ be convex cost functions such that $\alpha + \beta = \theta$. We assume that θ is strictly convex. Then for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$ bounded from below, there exists $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{F}$, such that*

$$f = \varphi + \psi$$

and for all $t > 0$

$$Q_t^\theta f = Q_t^\alpha \varphi + Q_t^\beta \psi$$

Proof. Since $f \in \mathcal{F}$, Applying Lemma 3.7 for $G = \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1}$, there exists a $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\nabla \varphi = \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1}(\|\nabla f\|) \frac{\nabla f}{\|\nabla f\|}. \quad (3.16)$$

Denote $T_t(x)$ the point such that

$$Q_t^\theta f(x) = f(T_t(x)) + t\theta\left(\frac{\|x - T_t(x)\|}{t}\right).$$

It follows that

$$\nabla f(T_t(x)) = \theta'\left(\frac{\|x - T_t(x)\|}{t}\right) \frac{x - T_t(x)}{\|x - T_t(x)\|}.$$

Combing with (3.16), we get

$$\nabla \varphi(T_t(x)) = \alpha'\left(\frac{\|x - T_t(x)\|}{t}\right) \frac{x - T_t(x)}{\|x - T_t(x)\|}.$$

Which implies that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$Q_t^\alpha \varphi(x) = \varphi(T_t(x)) + t\alpha\left(\frac{\|x - T_t(x)\|}{t}\right).$$

By the same argument, there exists $\psi \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$Q_t^\beta \psi(x) = \psi(T_t(x)) + t\beta\left(\frac{\|x - T_t(x)\|}{t}\right).$$

Summing the two latter equalities leads to the conclusion. $\square$

From this proposition and the fact that $Q_t^\theta f$ is the solution of a Hamilton-Jacobi's equation, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 3.17. *Let $\theta : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a strictly convex cost function with super linear growth. Consider the following Hamilton-Jacobi's equation:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v(x, t) + \theta^*(\|\partial_x v(x, t)\|) = 0 & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty) \\ v(x, 0) = f(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

Assume that the initial function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then for all convex cost function θ_1, θ_2 , with super-linear growth and satisfying $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = \theta$, there exists $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, and v_i such that for $i = 1, 2$, it holds

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v_i(x, t) + \theta_i^*(\|\partial_x v_i(x, t)\|) = 0 & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty) \\ v_i(x, 0) = f_i(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

and $v = v_1 + v_2$.

3.2 Equality between weak transport cost and transport cost

Now we state the last main result, a condition of equality between weak transport cost and transport cost

Theorem 3.18. *Let μ, ν be two probability measures absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. Denote g the convex function such that ∇g is the transfer plan for Monge-Kantorovich problem of quadratic cost. The following assertions hold.*

- (i) *Assume that there exists a cost function θ such that $x\theta''(x) - \theta'(x) \neq 0$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and*

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu) = \int \theta(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|) d\nu.$$

Then the function $x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\langle x, x \rangle - g(x) \in \mathcal{F}$, and ∇g is the optimal transfer plan of $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ for all convex cost α .

- (ii) *Inversely, if $x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\langle x, x \rangle - g(x) \in \mathcal{F}$, then for all convex cost θ , ∇g is the optimal transfer plan of $\mathcal{T}_\theta$ for all convex cost θ and it holds*

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu)$$

Now we are in position to prove theorem 3.18.

Proof. We first prove (ii): Applying lemma 3.7 by taking $f := x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\langle x, x \rangle - g(x)$ and $G = \theta'$. There exists a convex function φ of class C^2 such that

$$\nabla \varphi(x) = \theta'(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|) \frac{x - \nabla g(x)}{\|x - \nabla g(x)\|}.$$

It follows that

$$Q^\theta \varphi(\nabla g(x)) = \varphi(x) + \theta(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu) &= \int \theta(x - \nabla g(x)) d\nu \\ &= \int Q^\theta \varphi(\nabla g(x)) - \varphi(x) d\nu \\ &= \int Q^\theta \varphi d\mu - \varphi d\nu \leq \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Together with the fact that $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) \leq \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu)$, the equality holds.

Now we prove that the transfer plan does not depend on the cost function.

Applying proposition 3.7 to equation (3.20) for $G = \theta'$, together with the fact that $x \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}\langle x, x \rangle - g(x) \in \mathcal{F}$, we deduce that $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$. Now given a convex cost function α of class C^1 , apply proposition 3.7 for $G = \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1}$. We deduce that there exists $\psi \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\nabla\psi(x) = \alpha' \circ \theta'^{-1} \frac{\nabla\varphi(x)}{\|\nabla\varphi(x)\|}.$$

It follows that

$$Q^\alpha\psi(\nabla g(x)) = \psi(x) + \alpha(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|).$$

The conclusion follows by writing the definition of optimal transport and its Kantorovich's duality:

$$\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi} \left\{ \int \alpha(\|x - y\|) d\pi \right\} \leq \int \alpha(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|) d\nu$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\mu, \nu) &= \sup_f \left\{ \int Q^\alpha f d\mu - \int f d\nu \right\} \\ &\geq \int Q^\alpha \psi d\mu - \int \psi d\nu \\ &= \int \alpha(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|) d\nu. \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument, it holds

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha(\nu|\mu) = \int \alpha(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|) d\nu.$$

We now turn to prove (i): For all convex function φ , it holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$Q^\theta\varphi(\nabla g(x)) \leq \varphi(x) + \theta(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|). \quad (3.19)$$

Now let φ be the convex function such that $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) = \int Q^\theta\varphi d\mu - \int \varphi d\nu$. Together with (3.19), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta(\nu|\mu) &= \int Q^\theta\varphi d\mu - \int \varphi d\nu \\ &\leq \int \theta(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|) d\nu = \mathcal{T}_\theta(\mu, \nu) \end{aligned}$$

The assertion (i) implies that the inequality in the latter formula is in fact equality. Thus, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ν almost surely, equation (3.19) holds. We deduce that

$$\nabla\varphi(x) = \theta'(\|x - \nabla g(x)\|) \frac{x - \nabla g(x)}{\|x - \nabla g(x)\|}. \quad (3.20)$$

According to lemma 3.7, the conclusion follows. □

4 Links with the infimum convolution inequality

The so called infimum operator inequalities are first introduced by Maurey in [11]. They are closely related to Transport-cost inequalities.

Let us stay in the space $\mathbb{R}^n$ and adapt the settings before. We say that a probability measure μ satisfies the inf-convolution inequality $\text{IC}(\theta)$ with the cost θ if the following holds for all measurable functions bounded from below $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$:

$$\int e^{Q_\theta f} d\mu \int e^{-f} d\mu \leq 1.$$

This inequality was proved to be equivalent to the transport cost inequality (see [1]):

$$\mathcal{T}_\theta(\nu, \mu) \leq H(\nu|\mu),$$

where $H(\nu|\mu)$ is the related entropy of ν with respect to μ .

Now consider the inf-convolution inequality restricted to the class $\mathcal{F}$ (denoted by $\text{rIC}(\theta)$):

$$\int e^{Q_\theta f} d\mu \int e^{-f} d\mu \leq 1 \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}.$$

According to proposition 3.15, let α, β be convex costs such that $\alpha + \beta = \theta$, assume that $\text{rIC}(\alpha)$ and $\text{rIC}(\beta)$ hold, then $\text{rIC}(\frac{1}{2}\theta)$ holds. The proof is simply apply Cauchy Schwartz inequality and proposition 3.15, details are left to the readers.

We remark that in dimension one, the set $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of all convex function on $\mathbb{R}$. Gozlan and al. in [6] and [4] proved independently that for a quadratic linear cost α , the inequality $\text{rIC}(\alpha)$ is equivalent to the convex Poincaré inequality. For general convex cost θ , $\text{rIC}(\theta)$ is equivalent to the weak transport inequality $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta \leq H$. The implication that $\text{rIC}(\alpha)$ and $\text{rIC}(\beta)$ implies $\text{rIC}(\theta)$ is simply the fact that $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_\theta = \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha + \overline{\mathcal{T}}_\beta$ in dimension one.

Acknowledgement

I warmly thank my PhD advisers Nathaël Gozlan and Cyril Roberto for helpful advises and remarks.

References

- [1] S. Bobkov and F. Götze. Exponential integrability and transportation cost related to logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 163(1):1–28, 1999.
- [2] Y. Brenier. Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 44.
- [3] M. Fathi and Y. Shu. Curvature and transport inequalities for markov chains in discrete spaces. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2015.

- [4] N. Feldheim, A. Marsiglietti, P. Nayar, and J. Wang. A note on the convex infimum convolution inequality. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2015.
- [5] W. Gangbo and R. J. McCann. Shape recognition via wasserstein distance. *Q. Appl. Math.*, LVIII(4):705–737, December 2000.
- [6] N. Gozlan, C. Roberto, P.-M. Samson, Y. Shu, and P. Tetali. Characterization of a class of weak transport-entropy inequalities on the line. 2015.
- [7] N. Gozlan, C. Roberto, P.-M. Samson, and P. Tetali. Kantorovich duality for general transport costs and applications. Submitted, 2014.
- [8] N. Gozlan, C. Roberto, P.-M. Samson, and P. Tetali. Kantorovich duality for general transport costs and applications. 2014.
- [9] F. Hirsch, C. Profeta, B. Roynette, and M. Yor. *Peacocks and associated martingales, with explicit constructions*, volume 3 of *Bocconi & Springer Series*. Springer, Milan; Bocconi University Press, Milan, 2011.
- [10] A.-W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B.-C. Arnold. *Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011.
- [11] B. Maurey. Some deviation inequalities. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 1(2):188–197, 1991.
- [12] Robert J. McCann. Existence and uniqueness of monotone measure-preserving maps. *Duke Math. J.*, 80(2):309–323, 11 1995.
- [13] R. Rado. An inequality. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 27:1–6, 1952.
- [14] L. Rüschendorf and L. Uckelmann. *On Optimal Multivariate Couplings*, pages 261–273. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1997.
- [15] Y. Shu and M. Strzelecki. Characterization of a class of convex modified log-sobolev inequalities on the line. 2016.
- [16] Yan Shu. Hamilton-Jacobi equations on graphs and applications. Submitted, 2015.
- [17] V. Strassen. The existence of probability measures with given marginals. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 36:423–439, 1965.
- [18] C. Villani. *Optimal transport*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Old and new.